

13

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION

ANNIE STUCKEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHICAGO TRANSIT AUTHORITY,

Defendant.

Case No. 05 C 3346

Hon. Harry D. Leinenweber


MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion To Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (the "Motion"). When reviewing an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the Court must first determine whether the Plaintiff's allegation of poverty is untrue. 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(A). Here, Plaintiff is currently employed by the Chicago Transit Authority and receives \$800.00 per month in salary. She also has \$500.00 in savings, owns real estate worth \$120,000, and owns a vehicle worth \$14,000. Based on the information provided, the Court concludes that Plaintiff's allegation of poverty is untrue. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion To Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* is **DENIED**.

Also before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(1), which provides that "[t]he court may request an attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel." Section 1915(e)(1) is interpreted to require

a "threshold inquiry into the indigent's efforts to secure counsel." *Jackson v. County of McLean*, 952 F.2d 1070, 1072-73 (7th Cir. 1992). Here, Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that she is indigent or that she made any attempts to retain counsel. As a result, Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



---

Harry D. Leinenweber, Judge  
United States District Court

Dated:

